

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 11-17, 22-28 and 33 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled and no new claims have been added.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

The claims of this Application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this Application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Rejections – Double Patenting

The office action rejected claims 1-33 as conflicting with claims 1-27 of Application No. 10/840,889 (“the child application”). The Examiner is requested to hold these rejections in abeyance pending a allowance of claims in this or the child application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The office action rejected claims 1, 5, 12, 13, 16, 23, 24, 27 and 33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dichter WO 00/05679 and Sassin US 6,249,576. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended to overcome the rejection. The claims recite that “the object defines a function for sending a data trigger to a switch over a data network to initiate a telephone call over a telephone network.” New limitations are underlined. As such, the computer in claim 12 must be capable of sending the data trigger over a data network, and the switch must be capable of initiating a telephone call over a telephone network. Other patentable limitations have also been added to claim 12. Namely, the telephone call is over a telephone network between a first telephone corresponding to a previously stored

telephone number associated with the user of the client computer and a second telephone
corresponding to the identified telephone number. We assert that the combination of limitations
in the amended independent claims are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

By virtue of their dependency on the independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable
over the cited references for the reasons cited above. As such, all claims are patentable over the cited
references.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant
and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also
patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are
not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in
condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and
allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to answer any questions or to discuss
steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Andrew Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759

Date: April 3, 2006

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com